The Project Estimate Quality Assurance Report form (PDM Figure 1-02.8) has been revised. The new form is shown on the next three pages. It is also available as a Word form in the folder "DE-Scoping."

| County | | | Route | | | Job Number | | |
|---------|------------------------|--|-------------|------------------|---------------|-------------------|----------------------|-----------|
| | | Projec | t Estim | ate Qua | lity Assur | ance Repor | t | |
| Curren | tly Progran | nmed in STIP (Sele PE Only | | Right of V | Way 🔲 | Construction | | |
| Project | Pr C Pr R | ent Stage (Select Croject Initialization onceptual Plan/Enveliminary Plan ight of Way Plan ontract Plans | | al Docum | ent | | | |
| 1. | Has an est | imate for the curre Yes | nt milesto | one includ No | ing the annua | al estimate beer | made? | |
| | | mments: commendations: | | | | | | |
| 2. | Does the f | ile contain or desc | ribe the fo | ollowing (| Please indica | te): | | |
| | | Assumption Aerial or ma Design crite Other docur | ap ria | to clearly | | | r) | |
| | | mments: | | | | | | |
| 3. | Does the f | ile contain a copy Yes | or referen | ce to the s | source of uni | t cost or cost pe | er mile used for the | estimate? |
| | | mments: commendations: | | | | | | |
| 4. | | the current approv | ed or fina | l PATS fo | orm that mate | ches the STIP a | nd the current estir | nate is |
| | filed. | Yes | | No | | | | |
| | | mments: commendations: | | | | | | |
| 5. | Document Transmitta | eation for the right al. (Form 3-3.3.3c) | of way es | timate is p | provided, inc | luding right of | way Cost Estimate | |
| | | Yes | | No | | N/A | | |
| | | mments: | | | | | | |
| 6. | Document | ation for the grading Yes | ng and dra | ainage cos No | ts is provide | d. NA | | |
| | Co | mments: | | | | | | |

| | Recommendations: | | | | | |
|-----|---|-------------|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|------------|
| 7. | Documentation for the base Yes | and surfac | cing costs a No | re provided. | NA | |
| | Comments: Recommendations: | | | | | |
| 8. | Documentation for the bridg | e costs is | provided an No | nd correct. | NA | |
| | Comments: Recommendations: | | | | | |
| 9. | Documentation for the misco | ellaneous | costs is pro No | vided. | NA | |
| | Comments: Recommendations: | | | | | |
| 10. | Documentation for the utility Yes | y estimate | is provided No | and correct. | NA | |
| | Comments: Recommendations: | | | | | |
| 11. | Documentation for the P.E. o | costs is pr | ovided and No | correct. | NA | |
| | Comments: Recommendations: | | | | | |
| 12. | Documentation of the project accounted for in the estimated Yes | | and need, p | project scope a | and assumptions have been made | and are |
| | Comments: Recommendations: | | | | | |
| 13. | Documentation of the traffic in the estimate. Yes | handling | and constru No | action incentiv | ves have been made and are acco | ounted for |
| | Comments: Recommendations: | | | | | |
| 14. | Does the estimate appear to Yes | be reasona | able and aco | curate? | | |
| | Comments: Recommendations: | | | | | |
| 15. | Have the changes of the cost Yes | estimate | been docur No | nented and rev | viewed by the project manager? | |
| | Comments: | | | | | |

| Recommendations: | | | |
|-----------------------------|------|-----------|------|
| Signatures: | | | |
| | Name | Signature | Date |
| Quality Assurance Reviewer: | | | |
| Additional Reviewer: | | | |
| Additional Reviewer: | | | |